

35
1661
C94
ANALHYIS:

OR,

Saint PETERS BONDS abide;

FOR

RHETORICK

Worketh no

R E L E A S E,

Is evidenced in

A serious and sober Consideration of
Dr. *John Gauden's* sense and solution of
the *Solemn League and Covenant*,

SO FAR

As it relates to the Government of the
Church by EPISCOPACY.

By ZECH. CROFTON.

The Fourth Edition.

1722 1660

*Josh. 9. 19. We have sworn unto them by the Lord God of
Israel; now therefore we may not touch them.*

70
338 + 136
London, Printed for Ralph Smith, at the Bible
in Cornhill near the Royal Exchange. 1661.

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
—GIFT FROM—
DAVID H. MCALPIN.



TO THE
HONOURED

SIR LAWRENCE BROMFIELD,

Knight, and Colonel in

L O N D O N.

Honoured Sir,



YOU have been pleased (in order to compofure of our unhappy differences) to fuggelt unto a grave and learned Divine, a confiderable cafe of Conscience relating to Church-Difcipline, (*viz.*) *The confistency of Epifcopacy with the Solemn League and Covenant*; and you have thereby produced his Refolution unto the *loofing of Saint Peters Bonds*, (as he is pleased to entitle it): You may, Sir, remember, it is *Solomons* experienced Rule, *It is a snare (or stumbling ftone) to devour holy things, and after Vows to make enquiry*, (How to keep or retract them, faith *Mercer*) for that indeed many times the Refolution proveth more intangling than the Obligation; I wifh that this were not found the unhappy fate of *Dr. Gauden* his *fence and folution of the Covenant in point of Epifcopacy*.

Prov. 20. 25.

Truly, Sir, according to that little skill that I have in things of this nature, this *Refolution* to your inquiry is fo fadly fhipwrackt on the *uncertainty of the object, inadvertency of expreffion, and imbecillity of Answer and Argument*, thofe three Rocks that lay-

lay-way conscience-satisfaction , that it cannot arrive at its desired haven ; but notwithstanding its Angelical voice will leave Saint Peter as fast fettered as it found him. If, Sir, I may do it without offence , I would make bold to discover it , that some other attempt for Saint Peter's rescue may be undertaken.

Uncertain proposal of the object.

First, Sir, there is not a greater danger to be shunned by a *Casnist*, than a *mistake*, or *uncertain proposal of the object*, or *Ratio formalis*, of the obligation scrupled and to be discharged, which giveth occasion to the scrupulous conscience more easily to start from the most pinching Conclusions that are put upon it ; and herein, Sir, if I mistake not, the Doctor is very unhappy, for he propounds the object, or *Ratio formalis*, of the Covenant, under the general term *Episcopacy*, the which he well knoweth is owned as an appellation common to all and every the Governors of the Church, who are in Scripture denominated *Bishops* ; and by good demonstration *Bishop* and *Presbyter* have been asserted to be synonymous titles of Church-Officers, and are found to have been so used in the Primitive times of the Church, and Writings of the Fathers ; and in this sense the *Episcopacy* which he supposeth to be the object of the Covenant, intends onely the Government of the Church by the Ministers and Officers thereof, who may, and must in their several Assemblies (*ordinis causâ*) have a President or Moderator to regulate and dispose all things which belong to order, as in all policy to the Chair belongeth ; and if this be it he means by his *Episcopacy*, *Primitive*, *Regular*, *Reformed*, and *paternal Episcopacy*, which I could easily imagine when I observe the Emphasis of his universal discretive *All Episcopacy*, pag. 9. and else-where often mentioned, and that in an opposition to *some Episcopacy abused and fit to be extirpated* ; and that it is explained by the adjuncts, *Reformed and Regulated as it ought to be*, as pag. 8. and opposed to an *Episcopacy* the confessed subject of *abusive excesses and defects*, not onely in the execution of its authority, through the faults and infirmities of some Bishops and their instruments, who possibly were not so worthy and good, or not so wise and discreet, as became Christian Bishops, and Ecclesiastical Governors of Christs Church ; but also in the very inconvenience of its Constitution and Customs in England, pag. 10. In both

Act. 20. 28.

The true sense of Episcopacy consistent with the Covenant.

both which he confesseth, pag. 21. there needeth an honest and in generous Reformation of Episcopacy, beyond the former excessive, or defective constitution, or execution of it: And more particularly by that Explication which is annexed in pag. 14. The efficacious conjunction of it with Presbytery according to the Reduction of the most Reverend Primate of Armagh, and the consideration of the Lord Verulam offered to King James. If, I say, this be the Episcopacy he means, I humbly conceive in his Book he doth *sudare de nugis*, labour to little purpose; for so far is any intelligent Covenanter from looking on their looking back to the Primitive, Catholick, and Universal Government of this, or any other antient Churches, to endanger the turning of them into Pillars of Apostacy, as Lots wife was into a pillar of Salt; that they judge their arrival at it to be their Zoar in their escape from Sodom; and hereof he might have assured himself by what (pag. 22.) he professeth himself to know to have been the sense of the learned men in the late Assembly of Divines, and by Mr. Marshal's Declaration, that the Covenant was leavelled at the *Despoticum Tyrannum Regimen*; there are no Covenanters that know any thing of the true nature of Presbytery, but they will embrace this Episcopacy, as not onely consistent with, but the very complement of the Covenant as to that Point and Article, and will confesse this is not onely the honest, but literal and complexive meaning of it, and with him will condemn them for rigid Bigots and virulent spirits, to be sleighted, not striven with, who conceive themselves bound against such a Primitive, Reformed, and Regular Episcopacy under such a reduction (as I conceive) would prove the formal corruption of the Episcopacy covenanted against, and I hope he will find few, very few such Covenanters in England.

But if, Sir, by Episcopacy he mean (as I must confesse I am jealous he doth) that frame and fabrick by which the man of sin was made manifest, did advance himself in the Temple of God, above (not onely all his fellow-Ministers or Bishops) but even Magistrates, all that were called God; which was, by his appearance and exaltation, innovated into, and obtruded on the Churches of God in these Nations, on the fall of the Monks of Bangor, and was so exercised, that Anselm (whom Land succeeded, as in place, so in property, and almost power) did

The vulgar and late acceptation of Episcopacy repugnant to the Covenant.

ap-

appear *papa alterius mundi*; wherein Bishops as a species or kind of Ministers different and distinct from Presbyters; and so Superior to them, not onely in point of Order, but Office and Authority, together with all that *Hierarchy* by which it was executed; all which his terms do too plainly suggest when he speaks of the Episcopacy which England sometimes had, was lately destroyed, the legal Episcopacy, pag. 19. an Episcopacy wherein the Bishops are distinct from Presbyters, pag. 21. arrogate unto themselves the sole power of Ordaining Ministers, and to be the chief Conservators, Cisterns, and Conduits of Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial power, pag. 12. who have not onely Precedency and Order, but paternal Authority, pag. 18. and that not onely over People, but their Pastors; who are by this antithesis fraternal with them, and so filial to the paternal power of the Bishops; and make up the paternal, fraternal, and filial unity of Bishops, Presbyters, and People, pag. 5. Nay, in opposition to whom the ordinary Minister or Presbyter is divested of all power, and degraded of all dignity among the people; and the Bishop, as dignified above him, so distinguished from him by his *Lawn-sleeves*, which is plainly suggested when he tells us, *The people of England are not to be governed by their equals and inferiors, because they are in black Coats*, pag. 17. All these expressions, with many of the like nature, do seem to set up and point out such an Episcopacy, as is not Primitive and Regular: And I say, if this be the meaning of his Ediscopacy, as the word (in the vulgar acceptation, by the too long appropriation of it to such an unjust and Anti-christian frame of Government) may be understood: Truly, Sir, then I must be free to tell him, the sense and very Letter of the Covenant is clear against it, and binds the taker in terminis, to the extirpation of Prelacy, that is to say, the Government by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Arch-Deacons, and all other Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy. So that it is the thing, not its abuse; the subject, not its adjuncts; the Fabrick, not its defects and excesses, is covenanted against, nor will the Covenant be accomplished, or the Conscience be satisfied, by the removal of the pride, presumption, idleness, covetousness, and tyranny of Bishops, whilst the
pre-

prebeminence, prerogative, paternal power, and juridical authority, assumed by them as distinct from and above all other Ministers of the Gospel, as the only immediate Successors of the Apostles, and enforced by their High Commission and Star-chamber with other imperial Courts, Officers, and proceedings are continued and established; nor must he think by his Sophistical comparison, to deceive and delude the conscience, telling us; page 17, 18. *That, they that Covenanted against Popery, cannot think they did abjure, or must abhorre all those saving truths and duties of Christianity; which are mixed with Popery; for whatsoever is formal popery, though it be an English Mass or Altar, that, all that, though only that, must be abhorred; and I conceive it yet remains to be proved that the paternal authority of Episcopacy is a saving truth or Christian duty, or not of the formality of prelacy, and clearly intended in the word Hierarchy, Chief-Priest-hood, as the principle of all the unjust power and priority assumed and exercis'd over other Ministers; and so that very government covenanted against. It is no hard case of conscience to resolve whether a man may use the good and substantial materials of a destroyed Fabrick; but I conceive it an high fallacy, from thence to impose the very form resolved against.*

You see Sir, at what *uncertainty* we are left, whilst the *object of the obligation* is propounded under a general term, whose proper, primitive, and genuine signification, suggests *one thing* and the vulgar and long-used acceptation suggests *another*: and our *resolution* is darkned by the multitude of expressions, concluding sometimes one, and sometimes the other thing: which of these shall a conscientious Covenanter embrace? You cannot Sir, but know, the work of a Casuist, is, to be full, and clear in the discovery of the *Ratio formalis*, thing or matter; concerning which the conscience conceiveth it self obliged; and that it is a great unhappiness in an *Interpreter*, and much greater in a *Casuist*, to resolve *obscura per obscuriora*.

But Sir, that I may testify my willingness to understand him, and cement, what in me lieth, the sad differences in the Church; Shall I entreat you, will please to provoke the Doctor, and his Anti-covenant-Brethren, such as seem to advance and promote an *Episcopacy* scrupled by Covenanters; to speak out, and clearly

Presbyterial
episcopacy
limited.

to declare, whether they will admit the removal of the Government by Arch-Bishops, and that late Hierarchy; which he concludes, page 18. is dead, and must rise in another quality; and (according to what is suggested in the *Reduction* by him urged) consent to the establishment of Congregational, Classically, Provincial, and National Assemblies, or Synods of Church-Officers; *Communione concilio Presbyterorum*; to debate and determine the affairs of the Church, and exercise all Acts of discipline and Ecclesiastick power: In each of which if there be *Ignatius* his Angel, *Tirullian* his *Summus sacerdos*, or *Armagh's Bishop* or *Super-intendens*, for order sake to call assemblies, propound questions, gather suffrages, require Order and composure in audience and debate, pronounce sentence, and sign Decrees, and to be fixed in that place, enjoying all the dignities the reto be'oming, and to be distinguished by some special denomination from his Chorepiscopi or Colleagues; they shall not only enjoy my consent (who I hope make conscience of the Covenant) but also endeavour (which I think will not much need) that all the Covenanted Ministers may joyn with them in a Petition to His Majesty, that by a Synod (by his Majesties Authority) called, it may be speedily consulted and concluded on; under which I doubt not but the Peace of the Church will be preserved, and power of truth and godliness be promoted.

Dominering
episcopacy refused

But if nothing will serve them but Bishops, distinct in order and office from Presbyters, and exercising over them a paternal authority; appropriating to themselves the power of ordaining Ministers, and the succession to the Apostles, and the jurisdiction before noted; we must intreat him to produce those clear, pregnant, and constant beams of right reason, and true Religion, which shineth in the brightness, and stability of Divine and Humane Laws; which may be the pillars of this truth, firm supports of duty, sure bounds of obedience, and safe repose of conscience in this point; greatly darkned by the many disputes of Bishops and Presbyters; Papists and Protestants; nay, by the positive assertions of both Papists and Protestant Divines, and determinations of Schoolmen, who have concluded Bishops and Presbyters to be *Ministri ejusdem ordinis*, equal in office and authority, and in this very case of government; all which his very *Reduction* proposed doth not obscurely suggest. Sir, the con-

conscience is (by him confessed) to be more tender, than to be deluded with sophistry, or silenced by a pretence of Regulation and Moderation, which intends no other save a Reduction of Episcopacy to its pristine and corrupt estate, not unto Presbytery.

Thus, Sir, I have noted the first Rock, and the Doctors unhappy dashing against it, which must needs render ineffectual, whatever he after writeth.

The inadvertency of his expressions will appear no less evident, than his ambiguous state of the scruple, and its resolution, if we either observe its fierceness or falshood: The fierceness of it is much manifested in those multiplied invectives uttered against the Covenant and Authority which did injoin it, and persons who did compose it, in these and the like intemperate terms, "A Stratagem of State, a Flag of Faction, an engine framed of purpose to batter down Episcopacy, pag. 13. Inadvertency of expression.
"Covenanting Complements, -and Reformings of bungling Reformers, pag. 24. The petty composition of a few Fierce expressions.
"politick men, Subjects, not Princes, and very mean Subjects too; some of them, either as Lawyers or Ministers, a great part of whom, I and others well know to be no very great Clerks or Statesmen, fitter for a Country Cure, than to contrive Solemn Leagues and Covenants; whose heads, rather than their hearts; and their State-Correspondencies, more than their Consciences, brought forth the Covenant, pag. 11. The effect of Scottish importunities, English compliances, and Presbyterian insolencies, pag. 5. Brought forth by the Midwifery of Tumults and Armies, engaged and enraged Parties and Factions; whose wrath and policy were not probable to work the righteousness of God; evil Angels, turning our waters into blood, pag. 6, 7. These and many the like Railings, Taunting, and intemperate terms, much below the expected sobriety of a so publicly professed healer of Englands wounds: Yet as an evidence of his fury, he falsely chargeth the Covenant with most sad and unblest effects, and to have been the cause of all the "havocks in Church and State, improsperties, disorders, confusions, contempts, wars, spoils, bloodshed; upon all estates and degrees, contempt of Religion, and neglect of Sacraments, pag. 7. One of the great Rocks
B "for

False charge

for the King's shipwrack, no less than the Churches and
 "States, and that it was watered with the King's blood, pag. 8.
 I cannot but wonder to find Dr. Gauden thus an *after calum-
 niare*! for can any considerate Reader, or competent Observer
 of the transactions of our Nations in these last years, read
 these reproachful speeches, and not conclude them a *most po-
 sitive and publick calumny*? Let the Covenant it self be con-
 sidered, and can it, by reason of any tendency in it self, be
 charged to be the *proper cause* of such prodigious effects? Is it
 not the *most fervent profession* of *Piety* towards God,
Loyalty to the King, and *Justice* towards Men, that
 can be made? Is it not the *most firm tie* to Religion
 that can be fastned? and the *fullest security* of all kind of
 Interests, the *Prerogative of the King*, the *Priviledges of Par-
 liament*, and *Liberty of the Subject*, which can be given? Can
 any thing but ill-will represent to the world such *unblest effects* as
 the natural products of it? And if some persons engaged in it
 have engaged in, and acted such horrid impieties, inhumane and
 barbarous actions, under the false cry of the Covenant; shall a
 man of justice charge the bastard-brood of such prophaneness
 to be the natural issue of so solemn and sacred an Oath!

But, Sir, will not an observation of the time, when these sad
 and unblest effects fell upon us, acquit the Covenant from be-
 ing in the least accessory unto the production of them? If my ob-
 servation fail me not, and I be not mistaken in my account, the
 "throwing stools at the heads of the Bishops in *Scotland*, the
 "pulling down the *Starre-Chamber* and *High-Commission*
 "Courts (those grand supports of Prelatical power) the ri-
 "king away the Bishops Votes and Session in Parliament: The
 "preparations against *Scotland*, (by Bishop *Pierce* his *Bellum*
 "Episcopale) the tumults about *Lambeth*, the imprisonment
 "of the Bishops in the *Tower*, the tumults about *Whitchal*
 "and *Westminster*, with his late Majesty's departure from the
 "two Houses, the setting up his Majesty's Standard, the a-
 "rums of War, with many Battles and bloodshed; the vic-
 "lence of the vulgar against the Liturgy, Crosses, and Altars,
 "with all that confusion and disorder which attended our first
 "unhappy differences, are of some years date before the Cove-
 nant was imposed, or so much as devised or digested; all
 which

Confusion be-
 fore the Cove-
 nant.

which were not onely begun, but carried to some considerable progress before it had its being; how then could these be the black shadows of its appearing and prevailing in England?

Some have observed, that from the time of the taking of the Covenant, successe fell on the side of the Parliament, and things did thence-forward grow into a tendency to peace, and rested not untill it effected the Resolves that *His Majesties Concessions were satisfactory and sufficient ground of peace*. And here let it be noted, that it was so far from being watered with the Kings blood, that when the debate (relating to His Majesty) engaged the Contests in the House, which run the Armies on those high insolencies against the Parliament, as to pull out violently 120 Members, who in conscience of the Covenant, did pursue and struggle for His Majesties *Restoration with honour and happinesse*. And the Covenant was by that perfidious pack openly declared uselesse, an *Almanack out of date*, and violated with the highest impiety imaginable, to make way to that execrable murder of His most Sacred Majesty. Nay, Sir, can the *clamours of the Covenant* (which were so loud in Presse and Pulpit by the Ministers of London in their Representation to the Army at St. Albans (before they perpetrated their horrid designs) in their publick Vindication printed with their names subscribed, witnessing to the world the inconsistency of that barbarous proceeding with the Solemn League and Covenant) be so far out of the Doctors remembrance, as to charge the Covenant (so eminently approved the pillar of witness against it) to have been the *Rock of the Kings shipwrack*, and *watered with his blood*? Your Casuist was willing to have all the world to know *his innocency as to that inhumane wickednesse: Me-thinks, Sir, he should not quite overlook others no less innocent than himself.

Covenant con-
test against the
Kings death.

* Reprinting
his own Pro-
test against it

Moreover, Sir, many that are no *Rigid Bigots, or virulent spirits*, and have considered the concurrence of affairs in this Church and Kingdom, think, that without breach of charity or sobriety, they may conclude the *arrogancy of Prelates*, the *alterations of publick worship*, the *innovated Ceremonies and Superstitions*, the *Oath (with its et cetera)* binding to *Canonical obedience*, the *Excommunications*, *Banishments*, *Stigmatizing*, *Confiscations*, *Imprisonments*, and *High-Commission-Cen-*

The more like-
ly cause of our
late confusion

suers against pious Non-conformists, with the silencing and suspending painful, powerful, and pious Preachers, with the Arbitrary Illegal imposition of the new Service-book in Scotland, look much more like the natural parent, and proper cause of our late Confusions, Commotions, War, and Bloodshed, than doth the Solemn League and Covenant. But I intend not to retort or recriminate.

I shall, Sir, leave wise men to judge, how unlikely a course it is by such *unadvised expressions* to satisfy Conscience, which is so tender and tickle, that all offences should be avoided; passion is not onely a perturbation to the mind, but also a prejudice to the understanding of what is propounded; the answer had need be clear, and arguments convincing, that follow such provocations unto prejudice; which would make a sober (much more a scrupulous) conscience turn aside and read no further; when conscience is so tender that reason is ready to pinch it into passion, how little need is there to provoke it by railings and reflexion of just miscarriages? (much lesse unjust calumnies.) Though Ironies and Satyrs may become Oratours in reproof, they besem not casuists in the resolution of Conscience-doubts.

But I proceed to consider his Answer and Arguments, purposing by Gods grace to yield to the power of Reason that is in them, though they come under so great disadvantages as have been noted.

His Answer is, as himself suggesteth, double, Indirect, and Direct.

His first Answer is *Indirect*, an oblique stroak at the whole body of the Covenant, which work, how prudently it is undertaken, considering the universal obligation of the Covenant on all men, from his Sacred Majesty to the meanest Subject, let all men judge? and how proper to him, who (if my information fail not) is himself ingaged in it? It is indeed a notable piece of policy under pretence of *Reconciling the Covenant in one Article to Episcopacy*, to invalidate the whole, and expose it to vulgar contempt; but if it be sinful, let it go: His Rhetorick is Angelical, but let us try the strength of his Reasons unto the loosing of St. Peters bonds.

The main-strength of what he doth suggest against the Covenant, lieth in the *miscarried Circumstances* which do relate unto the imposing, and taking of it; (*viz*) its defect in point of imposing power; the *terror and tumults* with which it was enforced; the *policy and humour* from whence it did arise; and the *novelty or unacquaintedness* of it as to our English Laws and Constitutions, or the like: Unto all which I shall only desire the Dr. on serious and second thoughts, to give a candid, clear, rational, and Scriptural resolve, to this general Case of Conscience (*Viz*) [if an Oath, Vow or Covenant, containing in it matter good and lawfull, (though not necessary and positive duty) be imposed by fraud, (as was that of the *Gibeonites*) or force, and factions, Army, and tumults (as that of *Zedekiah* to *Nebuchadnezzar*) without any formal authority, other than a mans or peoples own voluntary Act and submission, which is new unto, and unacquainted with the Laws and Constitutions accustomed in the place, and to the people, and in something repugnant to Gods direction; be by reason of any, or all these miscarried Circumstances, void and null] I am much mistaken if he cross not the common resolution of Divines and Casuists, if he conclude the Affirmative, but let us consider his suggestions singly, and so we shall best try their strength.

The general scope of his arguments,

And his first on-set begins with an *I might shrewdly batter the Covenant*, and so he assaults it with that, which (I must confess) is indeed a battering Ram; and being admitted, will endanger to beat down all that hath been done in this Kingdom since 1641. arrainging, censuring, and condemning all the proceedings of the two Houses of Parliament; in which, I shall leave his prudence and discretion to be judged by such, as are sensible how far his Majesties Honour, the Kingdoms satisfaction and establishment in the desired peace, is endangered by so much as a Dispute thereof: But the strength of it lieth in this, the *defectiveness* of (and so the invalidity of the Covenant) as to any lawful, constant, or compleat authority, capable to bind the Subjects and people of England, in any Court of Conscience or Judicature, in which nothing can have any permanent bond, or tie in Law, except Gods word without the Kings consent; as the vow of a servant, son, daughter, or wife, &c.

First argument, the Covenant's defectiveness as to authority, page 6.

This

This I must confesse is a fierce assault, and specious argument; yet me-thinks I find a Covenanter fortifi'd against its force by the Wool-sacks of these considerations.

Answer to it. First, *The two Houses of Parliament* (and those two had more than ordinary power) *are co-ordinate, and sharers in the Legislation of England, and so a constant Lawful Authority.* It is, Sir, worth your observation, how warily in *pag. 18.* your Casuist binds the King to protect and preserve his *Episcopacy*, but barres his change of it, without the counfel and desire of the two Houses, whom he judgeth propitious to it.

Secondly, *This Covenant was ordered by the Parliament during their Session.* And although I will not determine, that an Order or Ordinance of one or both Houses, can have the force and *permanent tie of a Law* (which yet among us will admit a dispute by the ablest Lawyers, and many Purchasers will plead for with vigour) yet I think it will not be ordinarily denied, that it may lay the Subjects under a *permanent bond*; and I conceive these are terms very different, that is a *bond on Conscience*, which is not a *Law and Tie in Judicature.* Orders of Parliament, directing an Act presently to be executed, will not I hope be denied obedience, or the execution be voided by the after dissolution of the Parliament, especially where it is in its own nature permanent and abiding. An *Oath* is in it self *natura rei*, a permanent bond, once laid it ever binds. A Parliament are a Power sufficiently compleat to impose and enjoyn it; if they see cause to bring a Colledge or Corporation under any special Oath, by an Order during their Session, I hope no Englishman will question their Authority, nor Divine deny the Obligation of the Oath, nor the one or other determine this tye to be discharged when the Parliament is dissolved.

Thirdly, *The supposed defect hath been since supplied, and His Majesties consent or assent fully expressed, by His swearing the same Solemn League, and by Oath promising His Royal assent to all Acts and Ordmances enjoining the same; and by His Royal Declaration of the 16th. of August 1650. declaring His full perswasion of the justice and equity of every the Heads and Articles of the Solemn-League and Covenant; and so far, ju-*

justifying the taking of it by His Subjects, that He graciously professeth to know no friends but the friends of the Covenant; and no enemies but the enemies of the Covenant: Hereby, whatever defect was in the first imposing of it, is fully made up to fasten it on the people now it is taken; so that by reason of this subsequent Act, I may say, if by *Moses* he will be judged, to *Moses* he shall go; and admitting his parallel (which some doubt, will not in this case square) if the *Father, Master, Husband, in the day that he heareth the vow of the Wife, Child, or Servant, hold his peace*, (contradict it not) much more if He *justifie, allow, and commend it*, as His most Sacred Majesty hath done, on most serious and deliberate thoughts, in a most publick and solemn Declaration, it shall stand, and be established.

But Sir, suppose the Doctor can pull down this defence, and manage his battery's so as to make a breach on the Covenant; yet before he enter, I must sound a parlee with him, and desire him to tell us whether the *quod fieri non debuit, factum valet*, pleaded to defend the wanton Baptism of Children, and hasty Baptism of Women, be not more really pleadable in our case; To make the worst of it, "a tumultuous Assembly convene, and come before us with Sword and Scepter, and say they are a Parliament, and have lawful, constant, and competent authority, to command us; and therefore will put an Oath and Covenant upon us; and silly, inconsiderate we, are not so well skill'd in politicks, or acquainted with the constitutions of our Countrey, to detect their fallacy, but think all authority is within those walls, and obedience must be yielded to what is there commanded, and so we are beguiled into the Oath; May we thence cry out a Cheat? and so cast off the Covenant? and conclude it cannot binde? I doubt such Doctrine embraced will expose us to a three yeares Famine.

His first battery was so fiercely made, that it recoileth with a more than an ordinary Rumour; and makes him enforce it *pag. 6.*, with an *I might Eccho* (as indeed he hath done, for I find no certain sound in what he saith) *the violence and noise of those times in which it was hatched in England, and brought forth by the*

Violence of
times.

the midwifery of tumults, and armies; of engaged, yea, enraged Parties and Factions; All which, it is well known, was not so great or loud, but that the Lords and Commons in Parliament, the Commissioners of the Kirk and Kingdom of Scotland, with an Assembly of grave and Learned Divines, did after Solemn Humiliation, and seeking God, serious consultation, and sober debates; digest and determine the Covenant; and both matter and form doth bespeak it to have been no rash or preposterous product of Fancie: But suppose the worst; will the violence of the times put a nullity and non-obligation on the Oath? How comes the sentence to be so severe against Zedekiah: *He hath despised the Oath, and broken the Covenant, he shall not escape*, Ezek. 17. 18. Was not this Oath exhorted by Armies without, and tumults within? and yet is it so austere binding? whatever Turks, Papists, or Politicians say, shall a Christian and Protestant suggest a nullity of the Oath, because of the violence of the times in which it was taken?

His third indirect answer to the Covenant.

His next suggestion is a sound no lesse uncertain; he saith he might urge the *novity and partiality of the Covenant as to the English Laws and Genious*: That he might, and might when he hath urged it, explain it; for the matter of it is neither *new*, nor *partial*; it hath been often heard, and endeavoured in Englands; in the very point of *Episcopacy*, the removal of Englands Hierarchy hath been sued for from * *Queen Elizabeths* time, downward unto this day: and the Covenant secures all Interests without partiality; his surmise of *forrain influence*, *invention*, and *obtrusion*, calls for proof; and then it will but little relieve him; for an Oath enforced by forraign Conquest, or couzenage new to the Nation, and contrary to its Lawes, binds the conscience, and the supposed *contrariety* of the Law, is of no force to them, who conclude a Power in the Parliament to put a period to those Lawes, and a Solemn Oath or Covenant sworne by [the Legislators, and by them put on the people, seemeth to be the most full discharge of all seeming-contrary Laws that can be imagined; especially when the Royal assent is publickly given to it.

* Witness Dr. Whitel Epistle to Laude before his treatise of the Sabbath.

His fourth suggestion in his indirect answer.

He proceeds, *It might seem odious, to reflect upon the Covenant, as to the effects, and unblest consequences, which like black shadows, have attended it, appearing.*

ring and prevailing in England, *what havocks, improprieties, &c.* as before we have noted. This *reflexion*, I confess, cannot but seem *odious*, but not to the Covenant, unless these sad effects, and unblest consequences, be found to attend it, as its *proper brood and natural issue*, not accidental sequels, produced by the Covenants genuine tendency to them, not by wicked mens reluctance to order and piety, or perfidy as to what they had covenanted; but the *odium* will of its own accord reflect on him who is a *Covenanter*, and yet exposeth his solemn League and Covenant to *vulgar scorn and contempt*; who is a man of *justice and sobriety*, and yet *calumniateth* the Covenant with those sad effects which had their being and progress before the Covenant it self. Sure he dreams, that seeth the shadow before the substance is in being; and who is a *Dissembler* detelling the plea of *success* as the Judge or Rule of any cause, and yet maketh it the measure of the solemn League and Covenant.

Nor can his next suggestion be considered unto the encrease of his credit, in which he tells us, *He will not insist on the baskings of the Covenant, before it was adult or many years old, how it was soon made a Nephew, and reduced to nothing by counter and cross engagements, after it had served as one of the great Rocks for the Kings shipwrack, and been watered with the Kings blood, &c.*

5th. Suggestion
in his Indirect
answer, p. 7.

Truly, Sir, had I been at your Doctors elbow when he wrote this, I would have advised him to have been so far from *insisting*, that he should not have *inserted* this, which he calls *Basking of the Covenant*: For, Sir, will not every one cry shame that shall hear him say, *The Covenant was one of the great Rocks which shipwrack'd the King?* and, *The Covenant was water'd with the Kings blood?* Who can consider the *Kings reluctance to the Covenant* was not so much as inserted into His Charge, not once taken notice of by *Bradshaw* amongst those many reasons by him produced, to justify that most execrable Sentence pronounced against Him? Who observeth the *Resolves of the Parliament*, that His Majesties Concessions (though He refused the Covenant) were satisfactory? and that untill the faithful Covenanters were pulled out of the House by military violence, and the Band of the Covenant broken by the raging lusts of

some proud perjure d Apostates, there neither was nor could be the least proceeding against his most Sacred Majesty; and that his Majesty under a just dread of violence to his Royal Person in the Isle of *Wight* admonished Mr. *Jeremiah French* to preach the Covenant to the people as the surest security of His Life; and yet conclude Him shipwreckt by the Covenant? because some that had taken the Covenant did perpetrate that wickedness, will any rules of Justice or Religion charge it on the Covenant? Because the Covenant was violated by force, suppressed by power, and slighted by policy, was it therefore vacated? when? by whom? or with what Argument of right Reason or Religion was it ever baffled? Was not its vigour made visible by the *London Ministers Representation and Vindication*? was not its bond on conscience made legible by the *Lancashire and Cheshire plea for Non-subscribers*, and the testimonies of the Ministers in the several Counties of *England*, published with their names subscribed? and was it not indeed Imprinted by the invasion and devastation of *Scotland*? the sequestration and sufferings even unto imprisonment and death of many in *England*, pursuing his Majesties Restitution on the account of the Covenant? How can the Doctor confess, Doubtless the sense of the Covenant hath lately quickn'd many mens consciences in their allegiance to the King, so as to bring Him (as David) home with infinite joy and triumph, pag. 25. and yet here complain that it was so easily vacated in point of its express Loyalty for the Kings preservation? If it were ever vacated, when, or how was it renewed and re-inforced? If I may speak it without vanity, had not the firm bond of the Covenant vigorously contended in the point of Loyalty against the violent Powers which bare it down, His late Majesties Martyrdom had not broken forth with such lustre; nor His now Majesty (whom God long preserve) been restored to that estate of Honor in which we now enjoy him. So that the Antecedent of this suggested Argument will be most positively denied.

But if we should admit it, I cannot but wonder to hear a Divine say and infer upon it, *If it were so easily vacated in point of Loyalty, I do not see how it can be so binding against Episcopacy.* I think it to be no good Logick, and worse Divinity, from some mensevasion and violation, to infer a vacation and non-obligation; or from a vacation of it in one point, to infer its non-obligation

as to others; sin, indeed is apt, but it must not be allowed to engender sin; by Gods grace gradual violation shall not effect in me a total rejection of the Covenant.

His sixth suggestion seems indeed to be of more force than the former, (*viz.*) *The Covenant* (if so interpreted) *must needs grate sore upon, and pierce to the quick those former lawful Oaths which had preposessed the souls and consciences of most of us in England, not onely of Subjects, as those of All giance and Supremacy, besides that of Ministerial Canonical obedience to our lawful Superiours, but even the conscience of the late King as bound by his Coronation-Oath, &c. From which Oaths as we know no absolution, so neither can there be any superfetation of such a contradictory Vow and Covenant without apparent perjury.* To which I offer to consideration.

6. h. Suggestion in his Indiect answer. p. 8.

That the dissatisfaction of his late Majesty of blessed memory (and in nothing more blessed than in the conscience He made of the Oath of God upon him, and the charge He hath left His now glorious Majesty, That if God brought Him to His own Right on hard conditions, He should be careful to perform what He should promise) that is now beyond dispute; and His Majesty that now is, not onely free from those fetters which restrained His Royal Father, but also is engaged in the same League and Covenant, and this supposed contradiction cast out of doors.

And as to the contradiction of the Covenant to the Oaths of *Allegiance and Supremacy, non constat*, it appears not; nor would it ever (as it hath done) have quickned the hearts of some to suffer for, and to struggle under their Loyalty, untill His Majesties honourable Resitution, if it were so repugnant to them. Let its contradiction in this point be noted, and we shall speak to it.

And as to that of Canonical obedience to our lawful Superiours, its contradiction is suggested with an *If it be so interpreted*; Let the interpretation be cleared before the contradiction be concluded and argued; for if that Oath did bind an obedience to Bishops as an Hierarchy, and invested with paternal authority, and as a distinct and superiour Order of Ministry, and its unexplained *et cetera* included more; a grating upon, and piercing to the quick this Oath, was no other but duty; and then the argument is of no more force, save to speak the fretting of their spirit, who foolishly swear they know not what, and now desire to maintain it, more for fancy, than

conscience, for it is not yet proved that such are lawful Superiors in Church or State.

His seventh Answer or Argument is *ab incommodo*, the inconvenience (which must be very great and visible if it discharge an Oath) and here he tells us, *It must needs run upon a great Rock of not onely Novelty but Schism, &c.* Unto which I desire, Sir, you will please to observe.

1. The loss we are at by the uncertainty of the object; he urgeth this Argument with his universal discretive, *All Episcopal Order and Government*. We must, Sir, have a clear Notion of Episcopal Order and Government, before we can with care shun the Schism; nor is it explained to us by the general terms of *Practice and Judgment of the Catholick Church in all ages and places till of latter days*; for we know, that superiority and paternal power over other Bishops and Ministers, did too soon appear, and too universally spread after the Apostles days, unto the advancement of the man of sin; though it prevailed not without great reluctancy, and its removal hath been aimed at and endeavoured by the Reformation.

Again, Must we take it for granted, that conformity is essential to communion with the Church? and agreement in discipline unavoidably necessary to union? Certainly if so, we must make the very form of Discipline an Article of our Creed. And truly, Sir, the *jus divinum*, or Apostolical institution of the Form he seems to plead for, lieth too much in the dark for such a conclusion, and therefore the most himself tells us of it is, That it looks like an immediate Institution of Christ, *preceptive and explicite, or tacite and exemplary*, pag. 12. but he knows not whether; yet well knows, *simile non est idem*, and therefore he here calls it but an *antient tradition, and universal observation*; and then the 34th. Article of the Church of England secureth us from this Rock of Schism, whilst it teacheth us, *It is not necessary that Traditions be in all places one and utterly alike, &c.* In Politicks (we well know) different forms of Administration are consistent with union in the same Kingdom, and communion in the same Government; It is no strange thing to see Corporations in England governed by their twelve Jurors, without a Mayor and Court of Aldermen, but it would be thought very strange from thence to charge

charge them with sedition ! and it must be a *jus divinum*, and immediate institution, not *Apostolical Tradition*, or *Universal Observation*, must bar us from the priviledges any more than the distated properties common to all policy.

Moreover, Sir, if this kind of Discipline (*which he noteth some few Reformed Churches of later days want, though they do not condemn, but approve and venerate in others*) be so necessary a Nerve, that the abjuration and exclusion of it runs us on such a Rock of Schism, I see not how those Churches (*though their want be through necessity of times, and distress of affairs, put upon them*) can be owned in the union of the Catholick Church; for essentials unto union must not onely be revered in others, but enjoyed by themselves.

It is, Sir, worth enquiry, what he means by the *Catholick Church*; for besides the vulgar appropriation of it to *Rome*, and affection our late Prelates had to that term, his Note, *That the abolishing of Episcopacy is no small wall of partition newly set up to keep all Papists from due Reformation*, makes me jealous the *Cassandrian* accommodation is yet in the Bishops intention and endeavour; upon which they would not put that reproach, scandal, scruple, or affront, as to be without Bishops of *paternal authority*; but if so, happy is that Church whose Reformation carrieth them furthest off *Romes* Superstition, in Discipline and Worship, as well as Doctrine.

His eighth Answer or Suggestion is a Rhetorical *swade*, and insinuating plea, which hath wholly lost its force by the uncertainty of the object: *If conscience be erroneous*, we shall easily grant that it is *Equal and Ingenuous, Loyal and Religious*, to *Erroneous* reduce and confine it; which yet must not, and will not be straitened, *conscience must be rectified.* than the proper and genuine sense of the Covenant will admit; but as for that *extravagant, disloyal, unlawful, enormous, and schismaical sense*, against which he declaims, in which it could neither be lawfully taken, nor honestly kept, it must be determined by an Explication of his *All-Episcopacy*, and full demonstration of a sense so qualified, before there can be any more strength in this Rhetorick than in his Reasons: I must Sir, be free to tell him again, the Covenant doth expressly bind against the Fabrick and very Form of the late Hierarchy in *England*, not its *abuses, excesses, or defects* onely: though not
against

against the use of any thing which was good, and fit to be used in the succeeding form to be established; nor do I understand it to be such an unreasonable and irreligious (*Ametis*) transport for men to Covenant against all the right use of things that are good (but not necessary) because of the abuse incident to them, as he doth suggest, though the Covenant is not guilty of such obligation. But more of this in his Direct Answer.

The Covenant authority proved, not onely pretended by examples in the Old Testament.

Having assaulted the Covenant with his fierce Battery, and alarumed it with his frightful Ecchoes, he proceeds to level to the ground all those fair, but fallacious pretences (as he deems them) drawn to fortifie the Covenant from Scripture-examples, wherein the Jews sometimes solemnly renewed Covenant with God, &c. And the main and onely Morter-piece he lets lie, is, That it was that expresse Covenant which God himself had first made with them in Horeb and Mount Sinai, punctually prescribed by God to Moses, and by Moses (as their Supream Governor or King) imposed upon them; this they sometimes renewed after they had broken it by their Apostacy to false and strange gods. Unto the enforcement whereof, we must desire the Doctor to demonstrate, That the Law of Moses, or Covenant in Horeb, was not onely the Rule and Dictate of what matter they should Covenant, but the expresse Covenant which was, or did consist in the exact Recital and Repetition of that Law of the Ten Commandements, as the very form thereof; so as that they never varied or altered it, according to their special defections, in the particular points of their ties; and that this was the formal Government between God and the people in the times of Joshua, and before Israel's defection from God; or that this was the Covenant between God, the People, and King, and between the People and their King in the days of Jehoiadah: Or that this was the expresse Covenant made in the point of the Sabbath, and the putting away strange wives in the times of Nehemiah. These several occasions, and special obligations, do bespeak them to have been Covenants, conformed as to the matter of them to some part of the Ten Commandements; but as to their form and manner of expression, to have been squared by themselves.

But what ever was the matter or form of their Covenanting,

Imagine it will not be denied, that *the taking or renewal thereof* was their own political Act, done by their own will and power at the time, and on the occasion their own condition did require and dictate; and that many times without the consent of the King then ruling them, and so our Covenant (warranted for matter by the Word of God) is *by their example* justified, to have been a pious and prudent action within our own power to perform, though for the form of it, it be not any Divine dictate, or Sovereign prescription, yet better to be esteemed, than the petty composition of a few politic men.

Nor is there any strength in that; *we were not Apostatized to false and strange gods*, unless he will affirm no defection short of Apostacy from the true, to false gods, is a sufficient ground or occasion on which to renew Covenant; which I think neither right reason or Religion will allow; shall not gradual defections be restrained, and total Apostacy be superseded by a seasonable Solemn League and Covenant? Surely then *Joshuah* was too preposterous, in working *Israel* into Covenant with God, on a jealousy or rational conjecture of their future Apostacy; and had *England* no need to Covenant, when they were positing in doctrine, especially in worship and discipline, to *Romes* Superstition and Tyranny? Can any man consider the corruptions continued in *England* since the Reformation, and so defended; that nothing but a sovereign Remedy could remove them? nay, the very Retrogradations of the Reformation, by a return of many expelled Rites, and Prelatical power, and say, because she yet owned the true God, she had no need to Covenant? If covenanting be an Act within mans own power and choice; and defection from God and his wayes inchoated, or suspected, be a just ground and occasion, *Englands* covenanting is fully fortified by Scripture and Reason, and the pretences thereof no way found fallacious.

His last Suggestion in his indirect Answer is of no force; for admit that there is no precept or pattern for such a Covenant in all the New Testament (which directs us as Christians, and leaveth us to the Dictates of Nature, and discoveries of the Old Testament, in more publike and political Acts which concern us as a Kingdom, or Church National) or in the succeeding ages of the Church: Will it therefore follow, that such cove-

Covenanting is sinful? the Primitive Churches never were of such extent in the enjoyment of such power, under such publique defections, and in such capacity of covenanting as we have been. Must we enquire what hath been done in the Christian Churches to do that and no more, without regard to what may be done, the condition of the Church requiring it? may not the very *Ligue de Saint in France*, and *Oath et cetera in England*, though sinful in their matter; be good Spurs and Directions in Christian policy? May not the same meanes used to corroborate impiety, be lawfully and prudentially used to strengthen true Religion and Reformation? Why may not Popish policy teach Protestants to combine by Covenant, as Protestant piety and prudence did dictate to them a Confirmation in Religion by Catechising? Courses common to men are not to be condemned, because used by wicked men to wicked ends.

None Sir, do deny the Covenant made in Baptisme to be the only new Evangelical Covenant to all Christians, broken by wilful and presumptuous sinnes, and renewed by repentance, and the participation of the Lords Supper: But it seemes unto me a strange transposition of so grave and serious a Divine, to oppose it unto the Solemne League and Covenant (that piece of policy, rather than piety, as he is pleased to term it) The inconsistency of them I must confess is not to me visible; sure I am Baptismal Vows are no bar, but may be provocations to Solemn Covenanting to and with God; Let the matter of this Covenant be exactly scanned, and if it be in any one Article found repugnant to, or different from the Covenant made in Baptism, we will renounce the whole: I hope it will not be denyed, that Baptized Nations, and Churches may (in their publique and politique capacities) renew and amplifie that Covenant which was made in Baptisme: And truly Sir, the Solemne League and Covenant seems to me so little to differ from our Baptismal Covenant, that it is no hard matter to resolve it into those three grand Heads we are (instructed) were promised in our names when we were Baptized; and then all the difference will be in this; the Baptismal Covenant was personal and private; this publique and politique.

Baptismal Covenant, no bar to the Solemn League and Covenant.

But I pray let us note his specification of the difference he suggested, and the reasons of this inconsistency he urgeth; which he supposeth to be a *uaja xasua*, trying out, *How vastly different from this Sacred Covenant, this late piece of policy, more than piety is; and how little the true Covenant of a Christian binds him by his Baptism or Repentance, or the Eucharist against all Episcopal Government, I leave all sober-minded Christians to judge.* Truly Sir, his universal particle *All*, may make something look like a vast difference, if we could but understand the species he would pitch upon, as excepted by his discrete term; but the uncertainty of the object is that we cannot but stumble at in all the conclusions of his suggested Answers: Methinks such an out-cry of *vast difference* should have been warranted by a clear *Antithesis*; Opposites cannot appear but by their opposition; and yet he specifies no one Article different from our Baptismal Covenant; but sophistically evades with an *How little do Baptism repentance, or the Eucharist, bind against all Episcopal government*: These may sir, very little binde against it, and yet the Covenant and they be at no *vast difference*; for the question is not, how little the true Covenant in them agitated binds against all Episcopal government; but how much it binds to any? He is the first Divine I have found to plead our Baptism as the bond of Canonical obedience, and defence of Episcopacy; I never did imagine Discipline and order to be the expresse positive condition of Baptism, and the Christian Covenant thereby made *qua Christian*, the only new Evangelical Covenant; but especially this species of it, Episcopacy. I hope his *Ius Divinum* will be made as clear as the Doctrine of the Trinity, whilst it is, and must be owned as the absolute condition of Baptism, and nerve of union with the Church: Yet Sir, give me leave to tell the Doctor, if the late Hierarchy or Episcopacy of England (which he seems to advance as the late honour of the Ministry, and encouragement of Learning and Religion) be (as on an easie discussion it may be) found to be of the Poms and Vanities of this wicked world; we are not only a little, but very much bound against it; for our God-fathers and God-mothers did promise in our behalf, *That we should forsake them, as the Devil, and all his works*; and then he may well imagine, all sober-minded Christians must judge,

there is a vast difference between *Baptism* and such *Episcopacy*, and that he is acted with a strong zeal, that will by our *Baptism* bind unto it, who yet declared it to be but a tradition and universal observation.

But he addes a Reason to enforce it, and that is, *Since both the power of ordaining Ministers, and by them to consecrate and celebrate both Sacraments, was ever derived from, and by Bishops of the Church, as the chief Conservators, Cisterns, and Conduits of all Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial power, from the very Apostles the first Bishops of the Church, Acts 1. &c.* But Sir, is it determined and agreed on without controverſie, that the power of Ordination was ever derived by and from Bishops (in his sence paternal Bishops) above, and distinct from Presbyters? that so it must be concluded No Ordination by Bishops, no Minister, no Consecration or Celebration of either Sacrament: And so where these *Conservators, Conduits, Cisterns* were never laid, or have been any way cut off, Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial Power never came, or is removed, and quite gone; for without doubt this water must run in its own Pipes; were it not for that subordination and dependence of ordinary *Ministers, Shepherds, and Rulers* unto, and upon the *Angels, Presidents, and chief Fathers* of his Episcopal authority he at after noteth; I should by his adjunct Chief, have conceived that he would grant, *Some small Pipes had run from the Apostles times in unison with Christ our chief Bishop, and derived Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial power in the vacancy of his Bishops; which if he deny, the Church of Rome will triumph in his Episcopal union with her; but the Reformed Churches can give him little thanks for this Church-annihilating-Notion.*

Again, It is clear that *Episcopal and Apostolical Ministry* is *idem ordo*, the same kind, distinct from that of *Pastors and Teachers*? it must be imagined so to be, whilst *Bishops* only as *Bishops*, lay so much claim to the *immediate succession to the Apostles*: That the Apostles had an *Episcopacy*, we cannot deny; for we read of it in *Acts 1. 20.* Nor I think can it be reasonably denied, that the *feeding-ruling Elders* at *Ephesus* were *Bishops*; for so Saint Paul called them, as consecrated by the Holy Ghost, *Acts 20. 28.* and *immediate successors to* the

the Apostles; yet it is not evident that they were all *Angels, Presidents, and chief Fathers*, and such as set *Timothy* over them as their Bishop, must needs deny them so to have been; and then, Sir, some that wanted this paternal Authority, must be confessed *Cisterns of Ministerial Power, and Ecclesiastical Authority, and immediate successors to the Apostles*; and so the Bond of Baptism binds to *Gospel-Ministers*, as the *explicite and preceptive institution of Christ*, whilst *Episcopal order* can claim no more but *Tradition*, and that very disputable; the Prelatical Divines of our Nation would not be thus tied to the observation of the *Lords Day*, nor I to the observation of *Easter*; yet both these (especially the first) look as like an *immediate institution of Christ*, *preceptive and explicite, or tacite and exemplary*, as any order or kind of *Episcopacy* he suggesteth to be upheld by the bond of Baptism.

As to what the Doctor addeth concerning the *signal and invaluable injuries* offered to the persons of such excellent Bishops as England lately had, and still may have, and the abatement of the honour of this whole Church and its Ministry, &c. I wish it may be considered, That the Covenant is not levelled against any real Excellency in the Bishops, but an *unwarrantable greatness, power, and authority*, assumed by them, or attributed to them, which conferred an unfitting honour on the Church; and then the exclusion of it is no injury, and the mighty abatement thereof is a positive duty. I cannot think but that *learning*, and the *due honour of the Church*, may, and will be best encouraged by the vailing of that pompous, worldly state, and wicked superiority her Governours had obtained. The Churches *perspicuity* seems not to me so necessary, that it must needs shine in *Lawn sleeves*, and succession of Bishops of *paternal Authority* over their brethren; nor know I to what Churches, save those of *Rome*, (who make the succession of their Bishops the sole and singular Note of the true Church (a Superfedeas of such Episcopal Order) how ancient or venerable soever it be deemed) can be so scandalous as is suggested; I am sure few of the Reformed Churches see cause so to judge it; and then, Sir, we find little force in this his complicated Answer.

Thus, Sir, I have made bold to consider the Doctors *Indirect Answer and Arguments*, wherein he endeavoureth to shake and subvert

subvert the whole Fabrick of the *Solemn League and Covenant*; and in them (to my judgment) there is so little strength of Reason, or true Religion, that it affords but a poor ground for his insulting and triumphant discharge in *Pag. 13. These things being thus premised, are sufficient (as I conceive) to abate the Edge and Rigour of the Covenant, and to ravel that Cabel and Bond of Religious Obligation.* For, Sir, notwithstanding his supposal (asserted) *In good earnest there is neither Law of God or Man, requiring, imposing, or comprobatng any such Covenant:* The Boanerges's will find cause to thunder out terrour against *Covenant-breaking*; lest Rhetorical flourishes without strength of Reasons, should release the consciences of the vulgar from the power of Religious Bonds.

His Direct
answer.

It may be, Sir, we shall find more strength in the Doctors down-right strokes, than in his back-blows: His batteries in his Indirect Answers attempted, have bespoken his purpose to break in sunder the Sacred Bond of the Covenant: His power to effect it in point of Episcopacy must appear in his Direct Answer, wherein (we thank him) he looks on the Covenant *in the softest sense that can be made, as it is a voluntary Vow, or religious Bond, which private men spontaneously took upon themselves, &c.* But yet he suggesteth it was taken by very few, *not one fourth part of the Nation now living, and those few made to take it by the terrors of Prison, Plander, S. q. s. fration, and the like wracke.* Unto which (before we observe his particuar reconciling Answers, relating to the special point of Episcopacy) I propound to consideration, that

The paucity of Covenanters will not discharge its obligation. Be there never so few, I hope those few may be free in asserting, and must be faithful in adhering to the Covenant; in which their confidence may be the greater, for that His most Sacred Majesty comes in to make up the number.

But if the Doctor saw with my eyes, he would not suppose the number to be small; if all Tables were as legible as those of the Lords and Commons, I believe their number would be found many more than the fourth part of the Nation. But can any considerable Observer take notice the Covenant was imposed on, and submitted unto, by all sorts and degrees of men, in all Counties, Cities, and Towns tendred (and since testified by their pub-

publick subscriptions) by the most Ministers in the several Counties, unto their individual Congregations, and that under the success of War, which usually extendeth a Covenant unto all who come under its influence; and that the persons who were constrained to compound for their sequestred estates sware the *Solemn League and Covenant* as the main Condition in their Compositions; and yet (without the supposal of a very great mortality, imagine *with the fourth part of the Nation* to have taken the Covenant? The Doctor sure judgeth by such with whom he converseth, and I easily believe they are not a fourth part of the Nation; yet methinks he himself being to be reckoned into the number, might well conjecture them to be more.

But again, Sir, the capacity of the Covenanters is more considerable than the number; and will make it a question well worth consideration, Whether it be not obligatory to the whole Nation? When I consider the Lords and Commons in *Parliament assembled*; and under that notion and capacity swearing the Covenant, as the collective Body of the Nation, though not near a fourth part in number; I am apt to think it looks very like a *National Obligation*: For I know not how they can take pardons, if they make not promises in our names; especially when the assent of His most Sacred Majesty is made so legible by His Royal Subjection to the *Solemn League and Covenant*. I am much mistaken if the *Orph of Zedekiah and the Princes* (without popular Delegates) did not bind the people of *Israel*; I hope the Doctor will be more wary than to plunge the whole Kingdom into *Perjury*. That there was any such Logick as *Prisons, Plunder, and Sequestrations*, to enforce the Covenant; I am not well-pleased, I hope he had more fortitude, than to suffer his Reason and Religion to be so captivated, he knoweth the will cannot be compelled; and I imagine he will not make extortion by force, any more than fraud absolve the Obligation & warrant the recession or violation of an Oath; he knows that Nature and Scripture do teach the contrary. Whatever was *Cicero's* affection to him, he knows wherein he commends *Pomponius* the Tribune, as to his extorted Oath; nor will a Casuist deny, *Juramentum metum extortum*, to bind. Greater force can befige none to the making of an Oath, nor greater fury from God follow any for breaking the Oath so forced, than that which befel *Zedekiah* to the King of *Babylon*. But

But let us see by what strength of Reason he worketh our release from this *voluntary vow*, that we also may be free-men; and it is produced by several suggestions, whereof

Words in

Oaths do bind.

The first is a clear sophism or charm to vulgar conception; *They are not* (saith he) *the bare words of the Covenant, which as charms can bind any mans conscience to, or against any thing.* It is very true, for they may be Historically read or repeated by such, who are not capable of, or concerned in the obligation: But, Sir, if (as in our case) the words be uttered as expressions of the mind, and declarations of the purpose and resolve of the heart to engage God and men to expectation of performance, I hope they then bind; and that, not onely because the matter is *just, true, and good*, but also because *declared*. Is not ingagement of expectation in others unto the Obligation of our selves *the end of speech in Promises and Oaths*? whence else is that Caution of Casuists, That *the words of an Oath be plain, and clear, and commonly used and understood*, that the fallacy thereof may fall? I wonder at the Doctors Antithesis of Words unto Reason, Justice, Truth, Religion, and Duty, which we deny not morally and really to oblige men either by Gods general or particular precepts: But yet I cannot believe them to be as Iron or Adamantine Bands, to chuse good and do it, to hate evil and eschew it, long before the Withs and Cords of mans combining or tying are put upon them by themselves or others. This sounds in my ears like new Divinity, and Morality too: Oh the folly of Nations, who confide more in the Withs and Cords of Words, Promises, Covenants, than in the Iron and Adamantine Bonds of Truth, Justice, and Duty. I must confess I was so foolish, as to fancy my self bound to an Act, because *good, just, true, duty*; but much faster bound, because *promised or sworn*; and I have known many men boggle at an Oath or Promise, and fear to break it, who would make no bones of Reason, Truth, Justice, Duty, but snap them in sunder like a single tie; and me-thinks the Scripture placeth a great deal of strength in the words of a Vow or Oath, *Deut. 23. 23. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and perform, as thou hast vowed it willingly unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast spoken it with thy mouth.* And sure there was most Adamantine strength in the words of Jephthah, which put him into

into that agony, and constrained that out-cry, *I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and cannot go back?* Judges 11. 35. If Oaths and Promises are but *Wishes and Cords*, I marvel at the course and customes of Nations to lay them each on other, as the only grounds of confidence; and I much more wonder, mens faith should be more fixed in Gods Promises, than Properties; and God, though under the *Iron bonds* of his own mercy, justice, truth: yet, for assurance sake, should bring himselfe under the *Wishes and Cords* of promise and Oath, and then tell us *by two immutable things wherein it is impossible God should lie; we should have strong consolation*, Hebr. 6. 18.

His second suggestion is to me no less strange than the first; Every mans (*viz.*) Nor can any such Covenant bind any man in any conscientious bond, meerly by the power of a mans own imagination, I am sure it can never bind him by the power of another mans imagination: Oaths ought to be in words significant, whose sense may be obvious to every common capacity, shuffling and shifting the sence, and signification of an Oath, is the snare and perplexity of Conscience, policy of Hell, and Sophistry of the Devil: Men must be careful to understand every Religious Tie and Bond; and not *list to conceive by prejudice and pre'mption*; yet if his own imagination be not that which must guide and bind him, I am mistaken; I expect men to see with their own eyes, and be saved by their own faith; and did ever conceive discourse, interpretation, instruction, and argumentation, to intend, not a *Masterial Imposition*, but information of the mind, which might engender a right imagination for men to follow. I know not Sir, what your Caluist may make of an *Erroneous Conscience*; but Dr. Ames hath taught us, *Conscientia quamvis errans, semper ligat; & ille peccat qui agit contra Conscientiam*; an erroneous Conscience doth alwayes bind, so that he sins, who acts contrary thereunto; which cannot be, unless the Covenant bind by the power of a mans own imagination.

His third answer I do confess is drawn with some considerable strength; for no Covenant can bind us to the injury of anothers Right; Liberty, Power, or lawful Authority, private or publick; except such as are *sui juris*, involved in himselfe; and so *per accidens*; are hindered, and hurt in and by them, which I believe

believe he understands: but Sir, it loseth its strength in the *assumption*; for it appears not that the *extirpation of Prelacy* as it is expressed in the Covenant, doth take away the *liberty, power, and lawfull authority of King, Bishops, or Parliament*; himself tells us, the Covenant was levelled against the *despoticum tyrannicum Regimen*; and I have before noted, that it is the *unwarrantable pomp and power, and unlawful authority, and superiority of the Bishops above other Ministers*, which is excluded, and to be extirpated by the Covenant, untill the *Object* is agreed on, the force of this Argument may well fall.

Yet give me leave to tell the Doctor, it is worth his enquiry, whether the power of the King for *restitution*, and of the Bishops for *execution and administration* of Episcopacy (late'y acted in England, and now endeavoured to be restored) be not fully, and actually, by a just, lawful, and compleat Authority, *abolished* and taken away by the statute of 17. *Caroli*, repealing that whole branch of the statute *primo Elizabethæ*, which authorized the jurisdiction of Episcopacy; and barreth his most sacred Majesty from giving Commissions thereunto, and forbidding all Ranks and Orders Ecclesiastical from acting upon any such Commission in any matter or thing whatsoever: Sir, most men think that this power was lawful, and the Hierarchy of England was *sui juris* to, and within the power of King, Lords, and Commons; and this discharge of Episcopacy to have been no injury, and to have been acted long before the Covenant did exist; and so the Covenant was but an enforcement of this Law; and then Sir, if there be a Parliament which may look upon Bishops and Episcopacy with a more propitious eye, than these who beheld it through the Presbyterian spectacles, it will be worth enquiry, whether the Covenant (as is before noted) be not a National Covenant, and bindeth not the Parliament from preponing, and praying, and his most sacred Majesty from assenting unto the re-establishment thereof? and so whether the present actings of some Bishops and Deans be not without Legal and just authority; and the imposing or endeavouring to return that (by Statute) abolished, and (by Covenant) excluded Fabrick, be not a transgression of the Law, and plunging the Nation into perjury? which how consistent it is with the honour of King or Kingdom, let wise men judge.

The

The Doctors fourth, fifth, and eighth Suggestions do relate unto the good of *Episcopacie*; concerning which, he supposeth a good, which I must confesse I am not clear to admit; as for that good in this, which is common to all Governments (*viz.*) the Principles and proportions of Order, Subordination, and Government, we shall not deny it, only conceive it is not here pleadable; for, it may be continued in the Government which shall be established; but as to that of good in it, by Scriptural Precepts and Patterns in the Jewish Church, Apostolick constitution, and Primitive use of Ecclesiastical custome, and holy mens general approbation, and universal imitation, it is under dispute, and not yet obvious, and so not of force to conclude for it; and as to Englands experience of the much good done by it, since the Reformation, it is very obscure, whilst the best of benefit imaginable to have been reaped by it, hath been to preserve the Reformation in the state and degree in which King Edward the sixth, and Queen Elizabeth left it; for wherein hath *Episcopacie* promoted it? nay, rather wherein hath not *Episcopacie* (by its silencing and suspending zealous Ministers, excommunicating, imprisoning, banishing, and stigmatizing pious Christians, for no fault at all save endeavouring it) retarded the progresse and perfection of the Reformation? nay, hath not *Episcopacie* (by its turning our Chancels into railed-in sanctuaries, our Communion-tables into adored Altars, our glasse-windows into popish pictures, and changing our common and established Liturgy into a more compleat conformity to the Popish Mass-book for forms of administration, Order of worship, Rites and Ceremonies) brought the Reformation into a most palpable and apparent Retrogradation? and hath not then your Doctor cause to tell us it were extremely silly, and madnesse, prophanenes, and blasphemy to cry it down as evil, and engage in Covenant against it as such? truly Sir, to all his supposed good whereby it is so beneficial (in his eye) to the being, compleat and regular being of any Church, and none more than England, I shall only oppose that one evil, for which (were there in it no more) it deserveth to be decried, and extirpated by the Covenant, and that evil I find so inherent to *Episcopacie*, that this very moderate man cannot divide them, (*viz.*) the not only degrading all ordinary Pastors and Ministers in the sight of the people (making their Ministry greatly ineffectual) but also divesting them of all authority, and superiority over the people, preferring the people so, and

The goodnesse
of *Episcopacy*
denied.

above them, as their equals and superiours; whereby all their administrations whilst in *Black Coats*, are represented to be meet *Cypfers*, to which the Bishops *Lawn sleeves* must be the only figure significant: Sir, can it be lesse than duty, to extirpate that which doth engrosse to its self, and so enervate in others, *all Gospel Ministry*? if *Cephas* and *Apolls* be no *Ministers of Jesus Christ*, as well as *Paul* the Apostle, I see no cause to chide the *Corinthians* for their Schism; but passing his Hypothesis, let us try the strength of his Propositions by which he would bind the Covenant to his Episcopacie, and they found very strangely in my ears.

1. *A Covenant can bind no man in conscience against any thing that is in its nature good, or not Morally evil, for this were to bind a mans self and others beyond Gods eternal righteousness; this is unto me a lesson of new Divinity; for Sir, be pleased to note, that the good he speaks of is natural, not moral, much lesse Theological good; it is a good which is not in it self necessary, but may be necessary in its time and place: so that it is a plain Adiaphoron, a thing indifferent: that to bind men to what is morally evil, is a Covenant of hell, I can easily be convinced; but, that to bind them against what is allowed of God as good and lawful (but not duty necessary until circumstanced with time and place) should be so, is sure but one Doctors opinion. I did ever conceive Adiaphorons to be subject to the Magistrates command, and a mans own Covenant, and so distinct from Divine prescription; the eating of flesh is in its nature good, and not morally evil; the Apostle is apt to Covenant with a weak brother never to eat flesh; is this to bind himself beyond Gods eternal bonds of righteousness, or in a Covenant with hell? I mistake such Casuists as I have read, if they conclude not the contrary.*

2. *No man may vow or Covenant, much less keep any such Covenant as he hath taken intentionally against the evil, corruption or abuse of any thing, so as to involve the good and usefulness of it, and to condemn that to destruction and extirpation. Truly Sir, I must confesse not only judicial (such as is his instance of the Judge of all the earth in his righteous distribution towards Sodom, and so impertinent to his case) but also rational, and Religious discrimination of objects is good, and necessary, but that a Covenant involving good and usefulness, whilst it is intended against evil and*

abuse

Oaths may
bind against
good indiffer-
ent.

Oaths against
evil hindring
the use of some
good, do bind.

abuse, is therefore void, and not to be kept, I cannot believe : I have read, *Juramentum non esse illicitum aut obligandi vim non amittere precise ab hoc, quod videtur esse impeditum majoris boni*, an oath is not therefore void, because it hinders a greater (that is, more than simple) good : I shall willingly wish men may not be so transported as to swear against a good when it can be separated from the evil ; nor yet to discharge the Oath, because the good (which might have been divided) is involved : It is a mans duty to distinguish between the Superstructures of men, and foundation of Christ and his Apostles (of which order his Episcopacie doth not yet appear:) and it is a mans liberty to restrain himself from the thing that is in its own nature good and useful, when attended with plain and positive, nay, accidental evil. I knew a man passing through an old rotten house, got a knock on his pate, and in his passion, swore he would pull it down and burn it every stick; his work-man advised him to use some of the materials good and useful in his new Fabrick; the good man is conscious of his Oath (though rash and unadvised) Will the Doctor please to resolve his conscience? Or again, Hezekiah observes the brazen serpent (the sometimes means) and now Memorial of Israels remedy, and type of the Redeemer) abused to Idolatry, sweareth he will destroy it, and accordingly executes his Oath : suppose it at that time (as it had its good) to be as useful as before, it will puzzle me to charge him with iniquity for so doing.

Thirdly, No man can in conscience be bound by any such Covenant against that which may upon second thoughts and after-view, and better information, appear to be good and useful to him; he is here bound not to keep his Covenant in the latitude of his mistakes and presumptions, nor to act according to his prejudices and former supposals; but rather to retract his rashness and unadvisedness in taking it at first, and to act according to his present evidence of what is true, just good, lawful, and useful even in Episcopacy, &c. Truly Sir, this is to me such strange divinity, that I cannot but wonder D. D. should be attendant on the assertor of it; I am sure if it be admitted, one reason produced by no mean Casuist to defend the Obligation of an Oath extorted by fear, must fall to the ground, *Elegit id quod nunc visum est sibi melius*, he chose that which he then conceived to be the best; but according to our Casuist, he might, on an after-view discern hurtful, and so retract : How happy and chee-

Sanderson de
juramento præ-
lect. 3. Sect. 12.

He that swear-
eth to his own
hurt, is bound.

Sander. de Ju-
ram. Lect. 4.
Sect. 15.

ring would such a resolution as this have been unto *Jophiah* in his anguish and out-cry, *I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and cannot go back*. Why man, can you not on *second thoughts* and *an after-view* see the goodnesse and usefulness of your daughter? Retract the rashnesse and unadvisednesse of thy vow; and act according to thy present evidence; Nay, how advantagious had this resolution been to *Israel*, when *Joshuah* and the Princes preserved the *Gibeonites* to be *pricks in the eyes, and thornes in the side of Israel*? To what end do they plead, *We have sworn unto them by the Lord; now therefore we may not touch them*: Why, must they needs act to the latitude of their presumptions & mistakes? could they not on *second thoughts* and *an after-view* discover their craft, and discern them to be of the people commanded by God to be destroy'd, dangerous to disturb their peace, and divert them from their Religion? How sad was the fate of the sons of *Saul* in the want of such a *resolution* as this which might have saved them all from hanging? for the Scripture witnesseth, That *Saul slew the Gibeonites in his zeale to the children of Israel and Judah*, 2Sam. 21. 2. Without doubt on *second thoughts* & *an after-view* of the good which might ensue on the violation of that Covenant caught by fraud, I hope our Prelates will take care in the next Impression of the Common-Prayer-Book, to make the words in *Psal. 13. ver. 5.* conform to *Psal. 105. ver. 28.* it is but the expunction of a Negative particle, and for *disobedient*, we read *obedient*, and for *repenteth not*, we read *repenteth*; and so the Character of a man for heaven shall be conform to our Casuists resolution and Scripture-Text, *He that sweareth to his owne hurt, and repenteth*: I cannot but commend the correction of this verse to the Drs. care; for as it is now read, it is not onely different from the Original, but also dissonant to his doctrine whilst it is read in the Old Common-Prayer-Book, *He that sweareth to his neighbour, and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance.*

Thus Sir, I have tryed the strength of the Drs. Arguments, and find in them very little force to rectifie conscience, release *St. Peter*, and reconcile the Covenant with Episcopacy. Truly Sir, were Episcopacy in it selfe never so good, yet it must appear necessary before it break through the bond of the Covenant: It is now indeed *high time to learn righteousness and wisdom, the which works not more in any thing, than a conscientious cleaving to the Covenant,*

Covenant, and paying the vows made to God in the day of affliction: I freely consent with him, that cautious and conscientious covenanters take a calmer view, and exacter measure than perhaps he did at the first. But methinks he should not leave them to rules of so great latitude, that will not only discharge the Covenant, but all Sacred Religious ties: What Oaths can bind, if words are of no force, or but withs and cords? his own imagination of no influence? no good may be excluded or involved? and second thoughts discovering usefulness will discharge it? where shall be the certainty of humane contracts or force of Religious bonds, if these principles be admitted? who shall ever Scruple to make, or care to keep a Covenant, if other mens interpretations must direct it, and our own retractation on sense of rashness, may discharge it? If Sir, these Propositions be the Doctors props for Episcopacie, it will appear too prophane for pious men to meddle with.

Sir, I doubt not but he and all men shall find every conscientious Covenanter enjoy the comfort of his accomplished Oath, when in his place he hath seasonably advised, humbly petitioned, and lawfully endeavoured, to remove Englands old Hierarchy, and to restore such an Episcopacie, to be exercised by the officers of the Church in Common, and good order, as is nearest the Scripture, Primitive practice and perswasion of sober, grave, pious, and learned men, such as was the late Primate of Armagh; but if either His most Sacred Majesty, or any other in Authority fail in the exercise of their capacity (as the late perfidious Rump in their traitterous and uncharitable Declaration of September 20. 1650. maliciously suggested, he would, and as he seems to hope) to effect the ends of the Covenant, I hope it shall be no offence to mourn for their iniquity, and the iniquity of the Land; nor will it be inconsistent to that humble submission, active or passive, I confesse we all owe unto his most Sacred Majesty: whatever shall be the establishment in the Church (though never so corrupt, yet) whilst consistent with salvation, though it may occasion to me suffering, and a suspension of my Ministry, by Gods grace it shall not effect in me, (or such on whom I have an influence) Schism from the Church, or Resistance of his Majesties just Right and Authority; for whom, as I have not suffered the least, so if God should so far leave Him (which God forbid) I am ready by Him to suffer the utmost, in adherence to the Solemn League and Covenant, until it

be discovered a band of iniquity, a snare and gin for Schism and Sedition to act by to the dishonour of God, and reproach of Reformed Religion: Yet I cannot but most heartily pray for the honest and ingenuous Reformation of Episcopacy beyond the former defective or excessive Constitution or execution of it: which I doubt not will effect the corruption and extirpation covenanted.

I confess every conscientious Covenantanter oweth this Justice and duty.

1. To God, "to approve, love, desire, and use what is good, not being within his own power, and excluded by his Oath or Covenant; may and must, are things very different.

2. "To obey the King as chief Governour of Church and State, enjoying things lawful and honest (so not Covenanted against) though not the very best.

3. To pity "the Bishops and Fathers of the Church who have been there too injurious, or injuriously used, and pull downe all proud Prelates and paternal Authority over Presbyters, which abuse their brethren, and debase their Ministry, because in a black Coat.

4. To encourage Ministers, and endeavour the rescue of them from dividing Factions and popular insolencies which have befallen them for want of the King, and Ecclesiastical Order, but may be enjoyed without a Bishop advanced in power above his Brethren.

5. Love to the Church, in endeavouring its unity, peace, and prosperity in the ruine of Prelacy and establishment of an Episcopacy and over-sight duly constituted and carefully executed.

6. Care to his own soul; inward and external peace, not to be concealed by glosses, courted by Rhetorical flourishes, nor cudgelled out of his Covenant by most bitter sufferings, but to cleave unto it with care, constancy, and diligence, and take heed of all sophistical solutions, and subtle reconciliations, which endeavour to baffle the Covenant, and break in peices the very power of Religious bonds.

Sir, Knowing how tender and delicate a thing Conscience is, yet fearing it might be baffled and deluded by Sophistry undiscovered; I have presumed to surveigh your Doctors Solution of the Covenant, and give an account of my apprehensions of it; Covenant breaking is so direful a God-provoking sin, that I tremble to think of

Englands least tendencie to it; whatever men fancy to themselves if the Covenant being *the Rock of his late Majesties shipwrack*, it is visible that the violation of it hath been the destruction of our late *Usurpers*, who laid it aside that they might leap into their Chair of State: and it cannot be denied to have been the chief and *only* means of his Majesties most just and honourable Restoration; and an adherence to it (I doubt not) will prove the establishment of his Royal Throne; I cannot therefore but be grieved to finde contempt poured on the Covenant, not only by the vulgar, but such whose rank and gravity should make them more sensible of the weight and worth of an Oath.

When Sir your Doctors *Solution* came first into my hands, the Speech of *Julian Cardinal* of *Saint Angelo* concerning the *League of Vladislaus King of Hungary* with *Amurath the Turk*, came into my memory; and on observation seems too much alike unto it (I pray you pardon the comparison) the pretended principle of the one was *Zeale for the Church, and love of Religion*, and so of the other; the scope of the one was to *discharge the Oath*, and so of the other: the method of the one was to absolve by colour and pretence of binding under the Oath; so of the other: the Arguments of the one were defect of authority from Gods Vicar on earth, consent of Confederates, contrariety to former Covenants, exclusion of greater good, exposed to reproach and scandal, rashnesse and unadvisednesse in making, and the like; and such are the arguments of the other: the one was by a man of eminency, and esteeme, and engaged in the same Oath, so is the other: such is Sir the agreement in every point, that it would much better have become a *Jesuite or Popish Cardinal* than a Protestant Doctor, I cannot but pray they may not agree in their intended end, the breach of the Covenant; lest God make them agree in the miserable effect, the losse of the Christian Cause, ruine of King and people, and their perpetual infamy.

I shall Sir trouble you no longer, save to tell you this answer was dispatched in *two days*; and had waited on you much sooner, but that I hoped some more eminent and able pen would have pleaded the Cause of the Covenant, and matched the Doctor suitably to himselfe; such as it is you now have it; I desire it may be weighed in the ballance of Reason and Religion, without respect

unto

History of
Turks, p. 29
291, 292.

(1660)
unto the person, who by his meannesse and many calumnies (which
yet he weareth as his crown) is obnoxious to no little prejudice;
but if he prove a *Taylor's Goose*, *bar* and *heavy*, but *blinde* and *dark*,
will be contented to wear the Cap, whilst resolved to approve
himself no lesse zealous in the Religious than he hath appeared
in the Political or Civil part of the *Solemne League and Covenant*;
and make it his care to give God the things that are Gods, as *Cesar*
the things that are *Cesars*.

S I R,

Farewell, be faithful.

July 8. 1660.

FINIS.

